



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

this inscription is preserved, not in the *Βαββακείον* at Athens, but in the Polytechnicum. P. 262 (No. 261): for *Ὀλύμπιε* read *Ὀλύμπιε*. P. 264: for *Hinrichs* (note on line 12) read *Collitz* (*Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse*, etc.) P. 278 (No. 277): *ἐ[μ] Μαντρέαι*, which Mr. Roberts adopts, is very questionable. *ἐν* is at best very rare in Arcadian (see my paper on Arcado-Cyprian, Am. Phil. Assoc. Trans. Vol. XVIII), though it is true we have a case of *ἐν* in No. 277 (epic, despite Meister). P. 287 (No. 291): Mr. Roberts' expulsion of the *ν* in line 10, and his reading *τοῖ <ν> ταύτη [γε] γραμ(u)ένοι* is very doubtful. P. 298: by an omission, the age of No. 300 is not specifically stated; from the context, especially Kirchhoff's note, one might suppose No. 300 belonged to the sixth century, whereas K. expressly states that No. 300 is to be dated about 400 B. C. P. 335: *νάϊε* is written in one case, *Νάϊε* in the other. P. 338: *προδόμεν* is not an Ionic form. P. 339: note on l. 37 seqq. of No. 142. This entire § on *-ει* and *-ηι* in the subjunctive will have to be modified in the light of Schulze's paper in the twenty-second volume of *Hermes*.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

The Fables of Avianus. Edited, with prolegomena, critical apparatus, commentary, excursus and index, by ROBINSON ELLIS, M. A., LL. D. Oxford, 1887. Pp. xlii, 152.

Mr. Ellis has added to the deep obligation under which all students of Late Latin must feel towards him by his present edition of Avianus. The edition is both critical and explanatory. It might have been thought that little yet remained to do in settling the text after W. Fröhner [1862] had published collations of the Paris, and Bährens [*Poetae Latini Minores*, Vol. V] of the Leyden MSS. Mr. Ellis, however, has had his usual good fortune as a discoverer of fresh manuscript material. From the MSS which he has examined or collated at Oxford, Cambridge and London, he selects one [Harley, 4967, not earlier than 1300] as of "unique importance," while three others [all in the Bodleian, and ranging from the eleventh to the beginning of the fourteenth cent.] present numerous readings of interest. He has also collated the best of Fröhner's Paris MSS [C, which he assigns to the tenth cent. at latest]—the enormous Trèves MS of the tenth cent., which Bährens only collated "raptim"—the St. Gallen fragment, etc. It will be seen that this is the fullest critical commentary that has yet appeared; but in spite of the number and comparatively early date of the MSS, the text often stands in need of emendation. The emendations which Mr. Ellis either makes or adopts fall into two classes: (α) emendations of obviously corrupt and unmeaning passages; (β) emendations of metre and syntax, which are based upon general views of what is possible or not in Latin of the epoch of Avianus. (α) The following brilliant examples of the first class may be cited, VII 14: *Tunc insultantem senior de plebe superbum | Adgreditur tali singula uoce monens*, MSS. Mr. Ellis suggests *Adgreditur "tali cingula uoce moues?"* He proves from Varro, as against Servius, that *cingulum* was used for a dog's collar, and compares a similar corruption in the Codex Ambrosianus of Claudian. [Although this is almost convincing, it is perhaps worth while to mention the suggestion of a learned friend: *Adgreditur curta talia uoce monens*. This is based on the view of the Censor of Wopkens that *talìa uoce monens* was the

genuine ending, and that, a word after *adgreditur* having dropped out, the meaningless singula was inserted to prop up the metre. The omission of *curta* would be palaeographically very probable.]

XI 8: *Iurabat solitam longius ire uiam*, MSS. The bronze pot is speaking. Mr. Ellis points out that *solitam* is impossible "as the pots were on a quite exceptional journey," and restores certainly *solidam*, "its metallic course."

XXI 5: *Sed uox implumes turbauit credula nidos*. Most of the MSS give *credula*, but the vv. ll. *pauida*, *sedula* show that a difficulty was early felt. Mr. Ellis restores convincingly *acredula* (the poet apostrophizing the bird), which is glossed as *lusciniā* [the Paris C gives *De lusciniā* as the title of the fable] and sometimes corrupted in MSS to *credula*. Mr. Ellis follows the excellent advice of Cobet never to make a correction without giving a certain instance of a similar corruption.

(β) The second class of emendations depends on the positions advanced in the Prolegomena. In these Mr. Ellis elaborately discusses the name and personality of Avianus—his date, style, and metrical peculiarities. The MSS mostly give (in the genitive) *Aviani*, though the ninth century V omits the name altogether, and the Bodleian R (eleventh to twelfth cent.) gives *Avieni*. Citations in a grammatical treatise of the ninth century [in Hagen's *Anecdota Helvetica*] give *Avienius* or *Avienus*. (1) Fröhner believes that the true name was *Avianius*—a much commoner one, as appears from inscriptions, than either of the others. L. Avianius Symmachus was father of the orator, but the twenty-four lines which are cited from him by his son show no similarity to the writings of the fabulist. (2) The Oxford MS O adds the praenomen *Festi*, which would tend to identify the fabulist with the author of the *Aratea*. But the complete difference of style between the two writers, and the silence of all the other known MSS, negative this assumption. (3) The MSS testimony, however, is not equally decisive against the spelling *Avienus*, in which case our author might be identified with either (α) a pupil and correspondent of Ennodius, or (β) an interlocutor in the *Saturnalia*. Mr. Ellis prefers the latter; but his arguments against the friend of Ennodius are hardly conclusive, as they take for granted that the fabulist cannot be later than the fifth century—the very point which has to be proved. The Avienus of Macrobius—whose name is once at least written Avianus in the best MS of the *Saturnalia*—"is described as a modest and virtuous youth . . . who rarely speaks at much length himself, but keeps the conversation going by questions, interruptions, or whispered objections. Yet so far as his personality is introduced it is well suited to the character of a lover or writer of fables." The probability of this identification is increased if the Theodosius to whom the preface is addressed is the author of the *Saturnalia*. Some have identified him with Theodosius the Great, and two good MSS add *imperatorem* after the *ad Theodosium* of the preface. This testimony is of no more value than the addition of *Festi* to the title in another MS. A mediaeval scribe would have no compunction in making such identifications without a tittle of evidence, or in introducing his impertinent guesses into the text which he was transcribing. Mr. Ellis is amply justified in the stress which he lays on the general tone of the preface, which is that of an equal, not a subject; cp. esp. "*Habes ergo opus quo animum oblectes, ingenium exerceas, sollicitudinem leues, totumque uiuendi ordinem cautus agnoscas.*" On these grounds Mr. Ellis assigns the fables to

the last quarter of the fourth century, and traces allusions to them in several writings of this epoch—the Gratiarum Actio of Ausonius, which was delivered in 379, and more probably in a letter of Symmachus, I 101 [written in 380 or 381]: Qui fieri potest ut os unum contrariis adfectionibus induamus? with which he cp. Av. XXIX 21, 22. Mr. Ellis perhaps makes too much out of these references, as (whatever may be the date at which the fables took their present shape) their groundwork is at least as old as Babrius; and the same consideration prevents us from attaching much weight to the allusions to pagan customs, which might suit with the pagan revival of 380 onwards, but might equally well have been taken on by a Christian copyist from his pagan predecessor. Mr. Ellis subjects the metre of the fables to a searching examination, which leads him to the same result. But it is here especially that the inconclusive character of his evidence comes out most strongly. The traditional text ἐν βορβόρῳ βαρβαρικῷ κεῖται. It is full of sins against metre, syntax and sense. To what extent the last class should be corrected depends on one's general estimate of the literary powers of Avianus. Mr. Ellis perhaps rates these somewhat too high.

XVI 19, 20: Haec nos dicta monent magnis *obsistere frustra* paulatimque truces exsuperare minas, MSS. Mr. Ellis certainly improves the passage by reading *subsistere fluxa*—the first word being given in Bodleian O, and the second suggested by *lustra* of Bodleian B.

XXIV 4: Edita *continuo forte* sepulchra uident, MSS. Mr. Ellis restores very ingeniously the technical phrase *continuo fronte*; but is not this too abstruse for Avianus?

The metrical question is treated in the same way. He rejects or inclines to reject some fables—certainly XXIII, and less strongly XXXV and XXXVIII—which accumulate licenses of metre and grammar. In discussing the Epimythia and Promythia he shows a certain indecision, but ends by rejecting the latter, and leaving a stain on the character of the former. "In the Promythia I seem to detect a forger. Three of them are tetrastichs and all contain the word *alterius*. He would seem to have wished to leave his mark on the bastard children of his creation . . . The Epimythia, though at times and to some extent questionable, are not, like those in Babrius, so decidedly inferior to the bulk of the work as to justify us in rejecting them altogether" (p. xxxiv). What remains, however, is far from immaculate. Some faults are corrected by the help of the new MSS. XLI 18: *nobilibus ut*, MSS; *nobilibus ne*, B. XI 6: *uagus amnis*, MSS; *uagans amnis*, B. XXII 6: *precibus ut peteretur*, MSS; *cum peteretur*, Ellis, from the Bodleian X, which gives *ut peteretur confileretur*. But may not these MSS readings represent the attempts of scribes to improve the metre on their own account? Certainly, in XXVIII 12, B suspiciously obtrudes an impossible *hic* between *domini* and *ora*. In other cases Mr. Ellis resorts to more heroic remedies. In XXVII 10 the substitution of *cornix* for *uolucris* is over-bold. In XXXVIII 6 the substitution of *sannis* for *salibus* is specious, and is partially confirmed by a gloss over *salibus*, *cum reprehensionibus*, in a late MS. In the same spirit Mr. Ellis suggests emendations of other places where the received text would seem to point to a very late origin. In XXXVI 4 he changes *expositis* to *haec positis*, and, though he doubts XXXVIII as a whole, yet he is ready to improve the Latinity by

changing *laboratis* of v. 7 into *uaporatis*, and *debile* of v. 12 into *futtile*. Such wholesale improvement seems hardly worth while; even if an originally fairly correct writer has suffered from one or more mediaeval recensions—an hypothesis which the popularity of the fables renders not improbable—is it not hopeless, the tradition being what it is, to try to remove the barbarous superfoetations? Mr. Ellis has brought to the task a perhaps unique combination of literary taste, palaeographical insight and knowledge of Late Latin usage; if his attempt carries so little conviction, it is not likely that another will be more successful. The commentary is in Mr. E.'s most thorough style. A peculiarly attractive feature is the use made of fresh MSS evidence, e. g. XXV 14 on *sculperet*, XXXV 1 on *pignera*, 14 on nominatives like *luis*. The only criticism that can be applied to it is that of Scaliger on Casaubon's Persius: *la sauce vaût mieux que le poisson*. An index verborum ends the book; the commentary richly deserves one to itself.

WALTER ASHBURNER.

Crinagorae Mytilenaei Epigrammata ed. M. RUBENSOHN. Berolini, 1888.

The editor gives us in this monograph of 124 pages the 51 epigrams which bear the name of Crinagoras in the Palatine Anthology. He has had the advantage of a new collation of the Codex Palatinus made by Stadtmüller, who is himself purposing a complete edition of the whole work. This collation has been executed with great care; the first hand has been scrupulously distinguished from the second or later hands, erasures marked, and in every case an attempt made to recover the original writing. Explanations of the more difficult passages are given in Latin; and Prolegomena, amounting to 60 pages, discuss the life and times of Crinagoras, his diction and prosody, and some of the more disputed passages in the epigrams. On the whole, the work is conscientious and in some respects new; the writer, however, is obviously a very young man, and can hardly be said to settle many of the points which he has treated in the notes. Thus, in XXXI 5, οἱ δ' ἄρα δονήθησαν ἀολλέες, what is the meaning of *δονήθησαν*? It seems to be unique, and R. is therefore right in retaining it; but it is not satisfactory to find that no suggestion of the meaning, whether it is a mere variation upon *δούπησαν*, or conveys some additional notion, as is most likely, is attempted. Take again XXXVI 1-4, which the MS gives thus:

τῆς διος γενεῇ μὲν ἀγαρρικῇ ἐντὸς Ἀράξειο  
 ὕδωρ πιλοφόροις πίνεται Ἀρμενίοις·  
 χαῖται δ' οὐ μήλοισι ἅτε πον μαλακοῖς ἐπὶ πολλοῖς  
 ψεδναὶ δ' ἀγροτέρων τρηχύτεραι χιμάρων.

Several years ago I suggested in the Cambridge Journal of Philology that *ἀγαρρικῇ ἐντὸς* is a corruption of *ἀγαρρικόνεντος*. Dioscorides states that the *agaricum*, a kind of tree-fungus, grew ἐν τῇ Ἀγαρίᾳ τῆς Σαρματικῆς, and it is therefore reasonable that the Araxes should be described as abounding in it. The construction is of the condensed kind which, though perhaps not found elsewhere in Crinagoras, is sufficiently familiar to Greek scholars *γενεῇ ὕδωρ πίνεται* = *γενεῇ ἐστιν ὕδωρ ὃ πίνεται*.

In v. 3 the new editor accepts with no hesitation the conj. of Schneider, a